

CHAPTER 6

CAPITAL FACILITIES AND UTILITIES ELEMENT

INTRODUCTION

Capital facilities and utilities are the basic services which the public sector provides to support land use developments, both as they currently exist, and as they are anticipated to develop over the course of the 20-year growth management planning horizon. *The Capital Facilities and Utilities Element* provides a general summary of how and when these basic services will be provided to support future growth as envisioned by the *20-Year Plan*, and how they will be paid for.

The state *Growth Management Act (GMA)* establishes many of the requirements for the *Capital Facilities and Utilities Element*. The *GMA* establishes an overall goal to "ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards" (*RCW 36.70A.020*). The *GMA* requires that the capital facilities element include an inventory of existing publicly owned capital facilities, a forecast for the future needs for new or expanded facilities and a six year plan to indicate from what sources the identified future facilities will be financed. The *GMA* defines public facilities to include roadways, street lighting, sidewalks, traffic signals, domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, parks and recreational facilities, and schools. Public services are defined to include fire protection, law enforcement, public health, education, recreation, environmental protection, and other government services. The *Capital Facilities and Utilities Element* is intended to provide a general assessment of major public services which impact land use issues, rather than a detailed analysis of every service provided by government.

The *Capital Facilities and Utilities Element* must be consistent with the other elements of the *20-Year Plan*, particularly the *Land Use*

Element. Future development should be encouraged to occur in generally more compact patterns where public facilities already exist, because it can be served more efficiently and inexpensively than dispersed or sprawling land use patterns. The *GMA* dictates that "urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have existing public facility and service capabilities to serve such development, and second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served by a combination of both existing public facilities and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by public or private sources" (*RCW 36.70A.110*).

Providing new capital facilities in previously undeveloped and unserved areas may in turn lead to new development in dispersed patterns, and should also be avoided. The *GMA* states that "Further, it is appropriate that urban government services be provided by cities, and urban government services should not be provided in the rural area."

The *GMA* also emphasizes the concept of concurrency, which requires that needed public facilities and services be in place, or officially planned and scheduled to be put into place, *concurrent* with new development. This concept requires cities and counties to establish explicit levels of service, or minimum threshold measures, to determine if particular service is adequately provided.

New development applications which cause the minimum levels of service to be exceeded will not be approved unless improvements are made to correct the deficiency or unless corrective measures are scheduled and funded to occur within a locally established time frame, up to a maximum of six years. The *GMA* requires that at a minimum level of service standards be adopted for transportation. Other services should be reviewed for adequacy, but specific threshold standards are not required to be universally applied.

This element is organized into two sections:

1. Inventory and review of existing facilities and services, along with 6-year future plans for water, sewer, storm drainage, schools, law enforcement, fire, solid waste, libraries, general government buildings, electricity, telecommunications and natural gas services. The *Inventory and Capital Facilities Plan for Transportation and Parks* can be found in their respective elements; and,
2. Policies regarding the provision of these services. The policies provide direction in three areas:
 - a. ensuring the overall provision of needed facilities and services by public or private agencies;
 - b. Providing direction for the establishment of minimum levels of service and concurrency obligations for new developments to assist in the provision of these services; and,
 - c. ensuring that the provision of services is fully consistent with overall growth management objectives, which is ultimately linked to the ability to efficiently provide the services in the first place.

Emphasis throughout this document is placed on those services provided by Clark County government and, in particular, on transportation, water, sewer and storm drainage services which are mandated by the *GMA* for direct concurrency requirements. Capital facilities plans for all services provided within individual cities of the county are included within the individual comprehensive plans of Battleground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Vancouver, Washougal and Yacolt, although available information is included in this document for context. The 6-year capital facility and financing summaries are an estimate of future needs and are not official policy or budget documents of the service providers except where indicated.

SERVICES SUMMARIES AND PROJECTED FUTURE NEEDS

Table 6.1 summarizes who the providers of services are for the various jurisdictions within Clark County. Additional information

regarding city services can be found in the individual jurisdiction's *Capital Facilities Element*.

Table 6.2 summarizes the major capital projects, estimated costs and probable funding sources for identified services and utilities. Detailed information on each can be found within the document.

Table 6.2 attempts to isolate the direct capital costs attributable to Clark County over the next six years. In cases where services are provided by outside agencies, *Table 6.2* estimates the direct costs of providing service to county residents only. *Table 6.2* also attempts to exclude services constructed by developers as part of the development process, such as road, sewer, water, or storm drainage extensions or improvements.

DIRECT CONCURRENCY SERVICES

Direct concurrency will be applied on a project by project basis for public facilities of streets, water, and sanitary sewer. While the *GMA* requires direct concurrency only for transportation facilities, this plan extends the concept of direct concurrency to cover other critical public facilities of water and sanitary sewer.

Transportation

The capital facilities plan for transportation, including a projection of six-year needs and policies regarding concurrency requirements for the County are included in *Chapter 3, Transportation*, of this document. Transportation services include provisions for roads and associated improvements, transit, and pedestrian and bicycle systems.

Water

Water service is an essential element of all types of land uses. The majority of water users in Clark County are served by public water suppliers. In the urban areas of Clark County, public water is provided by the cities of Vancouver, Battleground, Camas, Ridgefield, Yacolt and Washougal, and Clark Public Utilities (CPU), a publicly owned utility which serves unincorporated areas of the county and the City of La Center's water system. The city water districts tend to be slightly larger than current city boundaries, with the exception of

Table 6.1 Providers of Public Services and Utilities in Clark County

SERVICE	BATTLE GROUND	CAMAS	LA CENTER	RIDGEFIELD	VANCOUVER	WASHOUGAL	YACOLT	COUNTY
WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM	City	City	CPU	City	City	City	City	CPU, City of Vancouver
SANITARY SEWER SERVICES	City	City	City	City	City	City	NA	CPU, Hazel Dell S.D., City of Vancouver
SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITIES	County	City	City	City	City	City	NA	County
PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Battle Ground S.D.	Camas S.D.	La Center S. D.	Ridgefield S.D.	Vancouver, Evergreen S.D.	Washougal S.D.	Battle Ground S.D.	NA
FIRE PROTECTION	District 11 and City Fire Marshal	City	District 14	District 12 and City Fire Marshal	City	City	F.D. #13	All non-municipal fire districts
LAW ENFORCEMENT	City	City	City	City	City	City	Sheriff's Department	Sheriff's Department
SOLID WASTE	Private Hauler	City	Private Hauler	Private Hauler	Private Hauler	Private Hauler	Private Hauler	Private Hauler
LIBRARIES	FVRLS	FVRLS	FVRLS	FVRLS	FVRLS	FVRLS	FVRLS	FVRLS
GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS	City	City	City	City	City	City	City	County
ELECTRICITY	CPU	CPU	CPU	CPU	CPU	CPU	CPU	CPU
NATURAL GAS	NW Natural Gas	NW Natural Gas	NW Natural Gas	NW Natural Gas	NW Natural Gas	NW Natural Gas	NA	NW Natural Gas

FVRLS--Fort Vancouver Regional Library System

NA--Not Applicable

CPU--Clark Public Utilities

Table 6.2 Summary of Estimated Clark County Capital Facilities Expenditures, 1994-2000

SERVICE OR UTILITY	MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS	ESTIMATED COST	FUNDING SOURCES
WATER	Well source and conservation projects	\$18.9 million	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems charges • Contributed capital
SEWER	Treatment plant and interceptor system expansions	\$65.5 million	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue bond sale
STORM DRAINAGE	Develop regional drainage facilities, complete drainage basin studies	\$64.0 million	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future Drainage Utility (or similar mechanism) and systems development charges • Existing drainage fund
SCHOOLS	Land acquisition and construction of new schools, expansion of existing facilities	\$141.1 million	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bond levies • Impact fees, where applicable
FIRE PROTECTION	Land acquisition, construction, remodel of stations, and purchase of vehicles	\$5.2 million	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bonds • Dedicated tax revenue
LAW ENFORCEMENT/ CORRECTIONS	Expansion of detention facilities, construction of new administrative bldg.	\$16.7 million	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Obligation Bonds • REET • Grants
SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING	Land acquisition and construction of new compost facility	\$4-8 million	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • User fees • State grants
GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS	Land acquisition and construct new and expanded facilities	\$37.4 million	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bonds financed through REET

1= Includes all school districts except Vancouver, Evergreen and Woodland

2= includes all Fire Districts except the cities of Vancouver, Camas and Washougal

the Vancouver service area which extends well beyond city limits. Extensive water service in the central portion of the county, including both the rural area and urban lands in the Hazel Dell area, is also provided by CPU. In some of the more remote rural areas of the county where water service is not readily available, CPU manages "satellite systems" which serve small developments and clusters of homes. The seven water providers adopted a *Coordinated Water System Plan* in 1992 to define service boundaries and establish policies for the provision of water service in the county. For further information on water provisions for the individual cities, refer to the respective city's *Comprehensive Plan*.

The water providers' systems consist of three basic components: source, storage and transmission. The source for virtually all water in Clark County, public or private, is from groundwater wells. Although adequate water supplies for individual domestic or small consumption commercial wells can be found in most parts of the county, aquifers capable of

yielding large amounts of water for extended periods of time are less common. Identifying and developing adequate water supply to meet future demand is essential in order to ensure the continued growth and economic viability of Clark County. Potential future supplies that have been discussed include various surface water sources, water from deeper aquifers, and additional pumping of existing wells. The most prolific aquifers are shallow gravel deposits along the Columbia River in southern Clark County. Individual water providers are required under the federal *Safe Drinking Water Act* to monitor the water quality of their production wells, subject to the review of the State Department of Health.

Although overall water capacity is ultimately determined by the physical carrying capacity of available sources, the delivery capabilities of individual purveyors are determined by available water rights. Consumptive use of 5,000 gallons per day or more of ground or surface water from a particular source point by any public or private entity requires a water

right certificate, to be allocated by the State Department of Ecology. Water rights are prioritized by seniority. In granting such a right, the Department of Ecology must find that no previously established water rights will be hindered.

Clark Public Utilities, the principal purveyor in the unincorporated area, obtains water from 30 production wells in the Hazel Dell and Hockinson areas, with an average total pumping capacity of approximately 18 million gallons per day (MGD). To ensure readily available water supplies, CPU also maintains 18 reservoirs comprising a total storage

capacity of 8.95 MGD. Water is distributed to the CPU system users through approximately 300 miles of transmission and distribution piping. Polyvinyl Chloride (PVC) is the predominant material used for the piping, which ranges in sizes of up to 16 inches diameter, with 6 to 8 inches being most common. Water flow is regulated through the system by 26 booster pump stations and 13 pressure reduction valves.

Clark Public Utilities projected future needs and funding sources are summarized in *Table 6.3*.

Table 6.3 Clark Public Utilities Capital Facilities Plan, 1994-2000

PROJECTS	ESTIMATED COST	REASON	FUNDING SOURCE
CONSERVATION	\$2,224,367	Concurrency items; needed to maintain adequate water service	System charges, contributed capital approx. 50% each
DISTRIBUTION	9,245,200	Concurrency items; needed to maintain adequate water service	System charges, contributed capital approx. 50% each
HYDRANTS	533,849	Concurrency items; needed to maintain adequate water service	System charges, contributed capital approx. 50% each
PUMP STATION	50,000	Concurrency items; needed to maintain adequate water service	System charges, contributed capital approx. 50% each
STORAGE	844,930	Concurrency items; needed to maintain adequate water service	System charges, contributed capital approx. 50% each
TREATMENT	355,719	Concurrency items; needed to maintain adequate water service	System charges, contributed capital approx. 50% each
WELL SOURCE	5,783,354	Concurrency items; needed to maintain adequate water service	System charges, contributed capital approx. 50% each
TOTAL	\$18,987,598		

Source: 1993 Clark Public Utilities Water System Plan

Clark Public Utilities is funded by system users, and operates entirely independently of Clark County. CPU indicates that systems charges are user fees applying to old and new utility customers. Contributed capital consists of improvements or moneys provided by new developments as they hook up to the utility system. Total costs through 2012 are estimated at \$53,942,158. Over the long-term, systems charges are planned to fund 67 percent of this total, with contributed capital accounting for the remaining 33 percent. This information and related details are included in expanded form in the *1993 Clark Public Utilities Water System Plan*. The *CPU Plan* has the necessary contents required by *RCW 36.70A.070(3)*, including inventories, forecasts,

and analyses of future plans and financing mechanisms. Clark County has formally incorporated the *CPU Water System Plan* by reference into the *County Capital Facilities Plan*. Future changes made to the *CPU Plan* should be reviewed for consistency with County plans on an annual basis.

Clark Public Utilities has reviewed the adopted County land use designations and the adopted countywide population target of 416,000 and determined that the *CPU Water System Plan* is fully consistent with these provisions and the additional service demands which they entail. If growth occurs faster than projected, CPU will utilize a combination of capital reserves, rates, Systems Development Charges and revenue bonds to finance additional projects.

Water is also supplied to individual homes through the use of private wells. The number of private wells in the county has been estimated at 17,000 to 25,000. Use of private wells is subject to the review and approval of the Southwest Washington Health District. Although legal, extensive private well usage raises health concerns, particularly in urban or small lot rural areas characterized by widespread septic system use or other activities which can adversely impact groundwater quality. Private wells will continue to be the primary water source in the rural area, but should be aggressively phased out in the urban area as public water becomes fully available.

Readers interested in water service provisions for individual cities within Clark County should refer to the respective city's *Comprehensive Plan*.

The collective water provisions of the individual city and outside agency capital facilities plans are consistent with the *Land Use Element* of the *County Comprehensive Plan*. Outside of urban growth areas, there is limited public water provision, and future expansions are generally discouraged by policies of the *Land Use and Capital Facilities Elements* of the *County Comprehensive Plan*. Rural water provision is provided by individual or group private wells, subject to the review of the Southwest Washington Health District.

Within unincorporated Urban Growth Areas other than Vancouver UGA the *Comprehensive Plan Map* has designated almost no land for short term urban density development which would require public water service. These UGA lands are affixed with an "Urban Holding" overlay designation, which explicitly precludes urbanization until a site-specific demonstration of serviceability is made. Provision for lands within corporate limits are addressed in the city comprehensive plans.

Within the Vancouver UGA there is a substantial amount of land under County jurisdiction which is designated for near term urban development without the *Urban Holding Overlay*. The City of Vancouver formally adopted a *Capital Facilities Plan* in January 1995 specifying how these urban areas would be served. In April 1997 the City Department of Public Works reviewed the adopted County land use designations and the countywide population projection of 416,000, and concluded that projected population in the

Vancouver service area can be served by the central facilities listed within the adopted *Capital Facilities Plan*. Additional line extensions needed to serve the higher population would be financed by development proposals.

Sanitary Sewer/Treatment Plant

Sanitary sewer services in Clark County are provided by the cities of Vancouver, Washougal, Camas, Battle Ground, and Ridgefield, as well as Clark Public Utilities and the Hazel Dell Sewer District. In general, the city sewer districts tend to be slightly larger than current city boundaries and each has its own sewage treatment facilities. Clark Public Utilities owns and operates the sewage system and treatment plant for the City of La Center. For further information on sewer provisions for the individual cities, refer to the respective city's comprehensive plans.

Within the county's unincorporated urban area, sanitary sewer service is provided by the City of Vancouver and the Hazel Dell Sewer District. The Vancouver service area encompasses over 50 square miles, extending well beyond city limits to Vancouver Lake to the west, 172nd Avenue to the east and NE 88th Street to the north. The Vancouver system includes two treatment plants and an industrial pretreatment lagoon.

Clark County no longer provides actual wastewater collection, having transferred operation of its collection systems to the Hazel Dell Sewer District in 1993. The county provides regional transmission of wastewater and treatment services for two wholesale customers, the Hazel Dell Sewer District and the City of Battle Ground. The county owns and operates the Salmon Creek Wastewater Treatment Facility, located near the confluence of Salmon Creek and Lake River.

The Hazel Dell Sewer District encompasses over 35 square miles and serves approximately 17,000 plus customers within the unincorporated urban area north and northeast of Vancouver, as well as portions of the Orchards area and the Hockinson and Meadow Glade satellite systems which were formerly owned and operated by Clark County. The district's service area is estimated to be developed at 40 percent of full coverage, with approximately half of the land area being physically serviced by sewer. Up until 1975, the district treated its own sewerage. Since

that time, the district has contracted with Clark County and the City of Vancouver to provide treatment services. The County's Salmon Creek Wastewater Facility provides treatment for over 80 percent of the district's wastewater.

Projected needs and funding sources for the Hazel Dell Sewer District are illustrated in *Table 6.4*. This information and related details are included in expanded form in the *Hazel Dell Sewer District Capital Facilities Plan, Volumes 1 and 2*. The *HDSD Plan* has the necessary contents required by *RCW 36.70A.070(3)*, including inventories, forecasts

and analyses of future plans and financing mechanisms. Clark County has formally incorporated the *Hazel Dell Sewer District Capital Facilities Plan*. The Hazel Dell Sewer District has reviewed the adopted County land use designations and the adopted countywide population target of 416,000 and determined that the *HDSD Plan* is fully consistent with these provisions and the additional service demands which they entail. Future Changes made to the *HDSD Plan* should be reviewed for consistency with County plans on an annual basis.

Table 6.4 Hazel Dell Sewer District Capital Facilities Plan, 1994-2000

PROJECTS	ESTIMATED COST	REASON	FUNDING SOURCE
EXISTING SERVICE AREA: TRIBUTARY TO SALMON CREEK TREATMENT PLANT	\$3,262,000	Line extensions to serve primary existing lots	Contributed capital, ULID
ORCHARDS AREA UNDER INTERIM AGREEMENT: TRIBUTARY TO SALMON CREEK TREATMENT PLANT	6,570,000	Line extensions to serve new and existing development	Capital Improvement Fund, contributed capital, ULID
Basin tributary to Vancouver Westside Treatment Plant	122,000	Minor line extensions	Contributed capital
MISCELLANEOUS	2,150,000	New office and operations center; other miscellaneous items	Capital Improvement Fund
TOTAL	\$12,104,000		

Source: 1994 Hazel Dell District Capital Facilities Plan and Norman, McDonald, Hazel Dell, S.D.

The Salmon Creek facility processes sewage in four basic stages. Incoming wastewater is sent through a headworks to remove large solids. The wastewater is then directed to large aeration basins, where biological agents, or microbes, are introduced to consume pollutants within the sewage.

Wastewater then proceeds to clarifiers, where remaining pollutants and microbes are segregated through a settlement process. Finally, the wastewater is directed to a chlorine contact chamber to kill remaining bacteria before discharge to the Columbia River. The operation and discharge from the plant is regulated by the Washington Department of Ecology (DOE). In 1993 the plant was authorized by DOE to process an average of 5.6 MGD of sewage during the peak month of the year.

In response to rapid growth, the plant is currently undergoing improvements and modifications, to be completed in early 1995, which will raise its capacity to 7.4 MGD. The county is also in the planning and early design stages of the next expansion of the facility, which is expected to be operational by late 1998 or early 1999, and will increase the capacity of the treatment plant to between 10 and 15 MGD. A capacity of 10 MGD will provide for projected growth through 2005. A full 15 MGD capacity will be needed to accommodate growth projections through the year 2012. These improvements will be primarily financed by the sale of revenue bonds, with payments on the bonds to be backed by the Hazel Dell Sewer District and the City of Battle Ground. The method of repayment will be collected from both existing and new customers. The new capacity will

primarily be financed by the Regional Facilities Charge collected from all new connections to the sewer systems by Hazel Dell and Battle Ground. Some portion of the cost will be borne by existing customers through the monthly sewer fees charged by Hazel Dell and Battle Ground.

The county will also provide parallel additions to one section of the piping leading to the

treatment plant, known as the interceptor, a cost of approximately \$500,000 by 1998. Through 2012, additional interceptor system improvements totaling an estimated \$8 million may also be needed to increasing overall system capacity to accommodate growth. *Table 6.5* lists the projected 6-year capital improvements for the county treatment plant and interceptor system.

Table 6.5 Clark County Capital Facilities Plan for Sewage Treatment System, 1994-2000

PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	REASON FOR NEED	FUNDING SOURCE
<i>EXPANSION OF SALMON CREEK TREATMENT PLANT:</i>			
1995 EXPANSION TO 7.4 MGD	\$3 Million	Concurrency item; maintain adequate treatment for additional growth	Revenue Bond sale
1998/9 TO 10-15 MGD	\$42m if 10 MGD; \$62m if 15 MGD	Concurrency item; maintain adequate treatment for additional growth	Revenue Bond sale
<i>INTERCEPTOR SYSTEM EXPANSION:</i>			
1997/8 IMPROVEMENTS	\$500,000	Concurrency item; maintain adequate treatment for additional growth	Revenue Bond sale

Source: Clark County Environmental Services Division

Through 2014, the treatment plant capacity will need to be brought to 15 MGD if not already done so.

Unincorporated rural Clark County is served by individual private septic systems. Since 1974 the installation of on-site septs has been regulated by the Southwest Washington Health District. The Health District estimates that over 50,000 septic systems are in use throughout the county, about half of which are located within urban service areas. Septic systems installed prior to 1974 were subject to virtually no regulation. Recent technological advances and the establishment of mandatory maintenance requirements on some subdivisions have limited septic system failure rates. However, the number of septic systems subject to mandatory maintenance requirements remains quite small, even of those installed after 1974. Septic systems will remain the predominant form of sewage disposal within the rural area, but will be replaced with public sewer as it becomes available in the urban area.

The collective sewer provisions of Clark County and the individual city and outside agency capital facilities plans are consistent with the *Land Use Element* of the *County Comprehensive Plan*. Outside of urban growth areas, there is

limited public sewer provision, and future expansions are generally discouraged by policies of the *Land Use and Capital Facilities Elements* of the *County Comprehensive Plan*. Rural sewer provision is provided by individual private septic systems, subject to the review of the Southwest Washington Health District.

Within unincorporated Urban Growth Areas other than the Vancouver UGA the *Comprehensive Plan Map* has designated almost no land for short term urban density development which would require public sewer service. These UGA lands are affixed with an "Urban Holding" overlay designation, which explicitly precludes urbanization until a site-specific demonstration of serviceability is made.

Provisions for lands within corporate limits are addressed in the city comprehensive plans. Within the Vancouver UGA there is a substantial amount of land under County jurisdiction which is designated for near term urban development without the Urban Holding overlay. The City of Vancouver is in the process of updating their capital facilities elements to demonstrate an ability to serve these urban areas in a timely fashion. The City of Vancouver formally adopted a *Capital Facilities Plan* in January 1995 specifying how

these urban areas would be served. In April 1997 the City Department of Public Works reviewed the adopted County land use designations and the countywide population projection of 416,000, and concluded that projected population in the Vancouver service area can be served by the central facilities listed within the adopted *Capital Facilities Plan*. Additional line extensions needed to serve the higher population would be financed by development proposals.

INDIRECT CONCURRENCY SERVICES

Indirect concurrency services include storm drainage, public schools, parks, fire protection, law enforcement, solid waste disposal, county buildings, electricity, natural gas and telecommunications. These services are necessary to support additional growth to varying degrees, but they have not been identified by the *Growth Management Act* as critical facilities to be applied using direct concurrency standards as is the case with roads, sewer and water facilities.

Storm Drainage

Unmanaged storm water runoff can result in flooding, elimination of fishery and wildlife habitat, pollution of the county's drinking water supply, and negative impacts to the aesthetics of the county's streams, lakes, and wetlands. The regulation and management of storm drainage in Clark County falls under the responsibility of the local municipalities and Clark County. City governments regulate and maintain the drainage systems within their city limits except as may be modified by interlocal agreements, such as the one between the City of Vancouver and Clark County for the operation of the Burnt Bridge Drainage Utility. Clark County regulates and manages surface water runoff in the unincorporated areas outside of city limits. The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) is responsible for the management of runoff from State highways and the effects of this runoff both inside and outside of the State rights-of-way. The 100-year floodplains are designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and are managed by Clark County, or individual cities. The U.S. government and the State of Washington, through legislation or administrative actions, greatly influence how local governments such as Clark County and

its cities are required to regulate and manage storm drainage.

Estimating future drainage needs is complicated by the changing state and federal mandates, public expectations and evolving research regarding storm drainage and its impacts to water quality. The county has regulated drainage flow since 1978, but has required treatment of runoff only since 1990. The County Water Quality Division estimates that as much as two-thirds of the long-term drainage costs facing the county are to address the impacts of storm runoff from existing developments which were installed prior to 1990 when treatment of runoff was not required.

The county currently owns and operates an estimated 20 regional water quality collection facilities which serve more than one development each and owns or maintains about 100 of the smaller single development facilities. Significant savings can be achieved through the planning and implementation of larger facilities, rather than use of a piecemeal approach. The principal capital costs facing Clark County in both the six and 20-year horizons are the construction of these regional facilities and the completion of drainage basin studies.

It is also difficult to precisely estimate what portion of drainage facilities needed will be constructed by developers through the subdivision process, and what portion must be constructed by the County. The 1994 County stormwater ordinance requires that all stormwater impacts from new developments be addressed on site. The ordinance may change in the future to allow for the provision of off-site water quality facilities, to allow for economies of scale through the use of a smaller number of large facilities. The stormwater capital projections carry the assumption that 50 percent of the total cost of future projects within the six and 20-year horizons will be constructed by developers, and 50 percent constructed by Clark County.

Technical basin studies and analyses are needed, as a matter of law as well as science, to calculate the proportional impact that individual developments will have on a particular regional drainage facility.

The county's six year projections for storm water facilities, as required by the *GMA*, are as follows in Table 6.6.

Through 2012, the County Water Quality Division estimates the total cost of capital projects needed over the 20-year planning horizon of the *GMA* to be approximately \$170 million. The annual maintenance costs, not usually considered as a capital expense, is estimated to be at least \$2 million per year.

Readers interested in storm water provisions for individual cities within Clark County should refer to the respective city's comprehensive plan.

Public Schools

In addition to their primary educational function, public schools serve as a community focal point and provide facilities used for a variety of community civic and recreational needs. Schools are not required as a mandatory concurrency item under the *GMA*, but are required by existing state law under *RCW 58.17.110* to be adequately provided for before land divisions may be approved.

Table 6.6 Clark County Storm Water Capital Facilities Plan, 1994-2000

PROJECTS	ESTIMATED COST	REASON	FUNDING SOURCES
PURCHASE AND DEVELOP APPROXIMATELY 100 REGIONAL FACILITIES	\$64,000,000	Concurrency item; need to maintain water quality and quantity LOS and to address problems associated with existing development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately one million from existing drainage fund. Approximately 63 million from future system development fees. Approximately 64 million from future establishment of drainage utility (costs to all users within utility area).
COMPLETE COUNTYWIDE DRAINAGE BASIN STUDIES	\$2,000,000	Need to establish System Development Charge Fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burnt Bridge Creek Drainage utility. Other funds yet to be identified

Source: Clark County Water quality Division

Educational services to elementary, junior and high school students in Clark County are provided by eight different schools districts, which are operated and funded independently of county or municipal government. Depending on district eligibility, approximately 50 percent to 75 percent, of the cost of capital facilities are provided by the State of Washington through the State Construction Fund. The remaining capital expenses must be raised locally, through the passage of bond levies, which raise the property taxes of all residential property owners within a particular district, and/or impact fees, which apply to new residential construction within the district. In 1990, approximately 19 percent of the county population was between the ages of 5 and 18 years. The school districts each prepare enrollment projections and plans for new facilities based on the comprehensive plans of the jurisdictions in which they are located.

The school planning horizon is typically 5 to 10 years.

State funding regulations result in new facilities usually being constructed *after* growth has occurred and a need can be demonstrated. For this reason, "portable" or "temporary" classrooms have become the norm in fast growing districts.

To meet minimum facility standards set by state and federal agencies, schools typically require relatively large sites of at least 10 acres for elementary schools, 20 acres for middle schools and 40 acres for high schools. These space requirements, land acquisition costs, area to be served, access and size, are significant factors considered by school districts in siting new facilities. Schools typically require a full range of urban services including public sewer, water, fire and police service, and in the past development of facilities beyond the urban fringe has led to

an extension of services to previously unserved areas.

Table 6.7 provides a summary of current school district facilities. *Table 6.8* provides a summary of the number of new school facilities that will be needed in the next six years based on population growth in these areas.

Higher education facilities within Clark County include Clark College, a 2-year institution and Washington State University

campus (WSU). Currently, WSU provides some programs and classes at the Clark College site. WSU is in the process of developing a new campus in the Salmon Creek area. Refer to individual city's comprehensive plan for further information on individual school districts as appropriate. Further information on school district projections not covered in the comprehensive plans may be obtained from the individual school district.

Table 6.7 Summary of Existing School District Facilities for All Clark County Schools

SCHOOL DISTRICTS	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS AND STUDENTS						
	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE/JUNIOR		SENIOR		OTHER SCHOOL FACILITIES
VANCOUVER GRADE LEVEL	22 K-5	9147	5 6-8	4285	3 9-12	4912	8; 208 add. enrollment
EVERGREEN GRADE LEVEL	17 K-6	9145	4 7-9	3967	2 10-12	2941	5
BATTLE GROUND GRADE LEVEL	6 K-4	3050	5 5-8	2733	2 9-12	3178	3
CAMAS GRADE LEVEL	3 K-5	1185	1 6-8	655	1 9-12	757	4
RIDGEFIELD GRADE LEVEL	2 K-6	817	1 7-8	267	1 9-12	401	3
WASHOUGAL GRADE LEVEL	3 ¹ K-5	1244	2 ¹ 6-8	594	2 ¹ 9-12	644	2; 87 add. enrollment
HOCKINSON GRADE LEVEL	2 K-4	776	1 6-8	409	Students attend Prairie High School		
LA CENTER GRADE LEVEL 6TH GRADE MISSING	1 K-2, 3-5	402	1 7-8	389	1 9-12	332	
GREEN MOUNTAIN GRADE LEVEL	1 K-8						

¹ View Point Alternative houses grades 1-12; Hathaway houses grades K-2.

Parks

The tables representing the priority capital projects for the Clark County Parks and Recreation Division are presented in the *Supporting Documentation to the Comprehensive Plan*

Fire Protection/Suppression

Fire protection in Clark County is provided by a combination of sources. Urban area service has been historically provided by city fire departments, while various fire protection

districts serve the unincorporated areas. The Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR) provides protection for all state trust lands located in the forested portions of in the eastern and northern ends of the county. The USDA Forest Service provides protection for the small portion of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest located in the far eastern area of the county.

In addition to providing fire protection, several districts provide emergency medical services (EMS) and basic life support and/or advanced life support. The City of Vancouver

also operates the only hazardous materials response team in the County. EMS calls have constituted an increasing portion of the fire districts' activities and responsibilities, at increasing cost.

Clark County has grown rapidly since 1980. Most of this growth has occurred outside of

the city boundaries in what was once the more rural sections of the county. Virtually every fire district has experienced some urban type growth. Fire districts within or adjacent to urban areas have changed their service delivery to reflect the need to protect an urban community.

Table 6.8 Combined School Districts Capital Facilities Plan, 1994-2000

SCHOOL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF ADDITIONS OR EXPANSIONS/REMODELS			ESTIMATED COSTS IN MILLIONS	FUND SOURCE	
	ELEMENTARY	MIDDLE/JUNIOR	SENIOR	6-YEAR EXPANSION	SECURED	UNSECURED
VANCOUVER	6 exp 4 new ¹	1 exp 2 new	4 exp 1 new	\$179m	State Match \$11.8m; Capital Fund N/A; 1994 Bond \$135m	State Match \$40m; Impact Fees N/A
EVERGREEN	3 new	2 new	1 new	\$57.2m	1994 Bond \$47.9m; Cap. Fund \$11m	St. Match \$22.1m; Imp. Fees \$3.3m
BATTLE GROUND	2 exp 1 new	2 exp 1 new	2 exp 1 new	\$67.8m	1993 Bond \$22.5m	St. Match \$45m; Imp. Fees unk.
CAMAS	3 exp 1 new ²	1 new ²	1 exp	\$27.1m	NA	Bond \$32.3m; St. Match \$1.3m; Impact Fees .3m
RIDGEFIELD	2 exp 1 new	1 exp	1 exp	\$13.6m	NA	St. Match \$1.4m; 1996-8 Bonds \$12.2m Impact Fees N/A..
WASHOUGAL	2 exp 1 new	1 exp	1 exp	\$21.1m	NA	State Match \$8m; 1996 Bond \$15m Impact Fees unk.
HOCKINSON	1 exp	1 exp		\$4.1m	Cap Fund \$1.1m	State Match \$1.6m; 1996 Bond \$1.1m; Impact Fees \$.2m
LA CENTER	1 new		1 exp			1995 Bond \$7m; St. Match
GREEN MT.	1 exp			.4m		

Source: Horenstein & Duggan Clark County School Districts Capital Facilities Plan

Exp= Expansions, M=Million, NA = Not Applicable

¹Includes three schools to be replaced (i.e. total facilities is 26).

²Zellerbach Middle School converted to elementary, New middle replaces Zellerbach

There has been a trend towards increased coordination and cooperation among the various fire and emergency service providers in recent years, and greater integration will be needed in the future. This will involve the joint use stations or other facilities, or even the merging of Fire Districts in certain cases. There will likely be increased consistency of standards and levels of services provided among the various districts, with the County

Fire Marshal likely playing a larger coordinative and oversight role. Fire protection and suppression services are in the process of becoming more proactive and preventative, rather than strictly reactive as has often been the case in the past. There will likely be increased incentives or regulatory measures to decrease the likelihood of fires occurring, such use of fire restrictive materials in all areas, or land use restrictions in fire-prone areas, as

well as on-site means such as greater use of sprinklers to suppress those fires that do occur. Estimated capital facility needs through 2000 are listed in *Table 6.9*.

Law Enforcement/Corrections

The Clark County Sheriff's Office provides law enforcement services throughout the unincorporated area and in the Town of Yacolt. The cities of Camas, Washougal, Battle Ground, La Center, Ridgefield and Vancouver

are served by municipal police departments. There is extensive cooperation between the cities and the county law enforcement forces involving shared facilities and provisions for mutual back-up in emergency situations. The Washington State Patrol has police jurisdiction on all state routes within the county, and is largely responsible for state facilities. The state also provides back-up for the Clark County Sheriff's Department and local jurisdictions' forces.

Table 6.9 Fire Protection Estimated Capital Expenditures by Fire District, 1994-2000

FIRE DISTRICT	PROJECTS	COST	PROJECTED FINANCING SOURCES
F #1 (<i>WASHOUGAL AREA</i>)	1 new, 1 remodeled station; 4 vehicles	\$900,000	General bonds and/or dedicated tax revenues
F #3 (<i>BRUSH PRAIRIE AREA</i>)	1 new station; 3 new vehicles	\$1,050,000	Same as above
F #6 (<i>HAZEL DELL AREA</i>)	2 new buildings; 2 new vehicles	\$1,050,000	Same as above
F #9 (<i>CAMAS AREA</i>)			Same as above
F #10 (<i>AMBOY AREA</i>)	4 new vehicles	\$600,000	Same as above
FD #11 (<i>BATTLE GROUND AREA</i>)	1 new building (see FD #6), 1 remodel	\$530,000	Same as above
FD #12 (<i>RIDGEFIELD AREA</i>)	1 new building (see FD #6); 2 new vehicles	\$400,000	Same as above
FD #13 (<i>YACOLT AREA</i>)			Same as above
FD #14 (<i>LA CENTER AREA</i>)	1 new station; 1 new vehicle	\$700,000	Same as above

Source: Clark County Fire Districts and Fire Departments, February, 1994.

The primary law enforcement facilities used by Clark County are the Clark County Law enforcement Center (main jail), the Juvenile Detention Center, and the East, West and Central Precincts. An agreement has been drawn up for the City of Vancouver and Clark County to share the East Precinct upon the annexation of Cascade Park and Evergreen areas. The Sheriff will continue to provide patrol and enforcement functions for the next three years through a interlocal agreement. Regional or shared Law enforcement and correction facilities including the main jail, the Juvenile Detention Center, The Clark-Skamania Drug Task Force (Task Force) headquarters building, the new 911 Emergency Center (CRCA and a leased facility for the Child Abuse Intervention Center (CAIC). These last three (3) agencies (Task Force, CRCA and CAIC) are inter-jurisdictional. In addition to these regional facilities, Vancouver, Camas,

Washougal and Battle Ground each has their own jail/holding facility. Larch Corrections Center, the only state detention facility in Clark County, is an all-male minimum security facility that houses 164 inmates.

Demand for law enforcement services is directly related to the population and employment for the area. Most of the growth in Clark County has occurred in the unincorporated, largely rural sections of the county. As a result, the Clark County Sheriff's Office has experienced the greatest increase in demand/need for services.

The traditional measure of levels of law enforcement services is the ration of officers to population served, which is a personnel and non-capital issue. Using the number of sworn officers as a measure of staffing is also becoming outdated as non-sworn personnel are being increasingly used to deliver services such

as community policing, problem solving and clerical functions. The level of law enforcement service for Clark County is increasingly evaluated based upon a demand or workload indicator, like calls for service and performance outcomes like crime clearance rates. Most calls for police assistance are associated with

places of residences rather than the workplace or commercial areas.

The following table provides information on the estimated capital expenditures for Law Enforcement and Corrections for Clark County. Information regarding individual cities law enforcement needs may be found in its own *Capital Facilities Element*.

**Table 6.10 Clark County Law Enforcement and Corrections
Estimated Capital Facilities Expenditures, 1996-2000**

PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	FUNDING SOURCE
JUVENILE DETENTION CENTER	\$18.5 million	General Obligation Bonds financed through Sales Tax Increase
SPECIAL DETENTION	\$5.0 million	General Obligation Bonds financed through Sales Real Estate Excise Tax
CORRECTIONS CENTER EXPANSION	\$60.0 million	Same as Juvenile Detention Center expansion above

Source: Clark County Office of Budget

Note: Within 20 years, three (3) precinct offices currently being rented will be purchased, at an estimated cost of \$1.1 million.

Solid Waste Disposal

Solid waste collection and recycling operations in Clark County and its associated cities are conducted almost entirely by private contractors. Within the unincorporated portions of the county these services are conducted by four private companies with distinct and separate areas of collection, under the regulatory authority of the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC). Clark County has no authority to directly contract for solid waste collection services, other than for the collection of residential recyclable materials. Cities and towns have the option to contract directly for collection services, provide the collection themselves or defer regulation to the WUTC. Currently, only Battle Ground, La Center and Yacolt defer collection company

regulation to the WUTC. Vancouver, Ridgefield and Washougal contract their services to private haulers, while the City of Camas provides its own garbage collection.

Waste collected by the WUTC certified haulers, city contracted haulers, and self-haulers is initially disposed of at the Central Transfer and Recycling Center or the River Road Materials Recovery Facilities in Clark County for further processing and recovery of recyclable materials. Non-recyclable waste is transported for final disposal to the Finely Buttes Landfill in Morrow County, Oregon. The transfer facilities, landfill and transportation of materials are operated by the Columbia Resource Company (CRC). The CRC system replaced the in-county Lechner Landfill which closed on December 31, 1991.

Table 6.11 Clark County Capital Facilities Plan for Solid Waste and Recycling Systems, 1994-2000

PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	REASON FOR NEED	FUNDING SOURCE
CONSTRUCTION OF NEW COUNTY COMPOST FACILITY	\$4-8 million	Need to manage variety of waste streams	User fees, State Solid Waste Recycling Grants

Source: Clark County Environmental Services Division

Currently, weekly curbside collection of a variety of recyclable materials is provided to residents of the cities of Camas, Washougal,

Vancouver, and within a designated urban service area of unincorporated Clark County. A rural recycling program, which will include

those areas not currently served, is being developed. The designation of urban and rural recycling service areas is consistent with the solid waste planning requirements of Washington *RCW 70.95*, and will allow Clark County to comply with the State of Oregon recycling requirements imposed because of the use of the Oregon landfill. Within the next 6 years there will be the need to acquire and develop a county compost facility.

Public Safety Communications

The County, through CRCA, has been researching and planning for public safety communications upgrades county-wide for many years. The existing system is aged and inadequate for today's and tomorrow's needs. As a part of the FY 1996 budget the Commissioners approved a capital budget program of \$13.5 million, to upgrade the public safety communications. This is the culmination of the last two (2) years of intense effort to move this important project forward. The plan is to use an 800 MHz trunked radio system, purchased from Motorola Communications and Electronics. The system will be a Clark County owned proprietary

system that is compatible with the Portland, Washington County, Oregon and future Clackamas County, Oregon systems.

The initial costs to construct and install the system will be done by Clark County and funded via general obligation bond debt. Because this equipment is so highly technical in nature, it is anticipated that most of the system will require replacement within ten (10) years. The radios will be replaced prior to that (5-8 years). The cost of replacement will be approximately the same as the initial installation due to inflation, even though there are some components that will not require replacement. The funding for replacement of the backbone will be borne by the users of the system through a reserve built for that purpose. The replacement of the radios will be the sole responsibility of the respective users.

The location(s) for the towers for this project are specified in the *800 MHz Communications Project* plan developed by Motorola Communications and Electronics in December 1995.

**Table 6.12 Public Safety Communications
Estimated Capital Facilities Expenditures, 1996 - 2000**

PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	FUNDING SOURCE(S)
800 MHz COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM	\$13.5 Million	General Obligation Bonds financed through Real Estate Excise Tax and CRCA 911 Tax Revenues.
800 MHz COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM - REPLACEMENT	\$13.5 Million	General Obligation Bonds financed through CRCA 911 Tax Revenues and/or User Fees.

Source: Clark County Office of Budget

Note: Due to the technical nature of this equipment most of it will require replacement every 5-10 years, on an ongoing basis.

General Government Buildings

Clark County presently owns or rents 26 buildings comprising almost 5 million square feet of total floor space, as indicated in *Table 6.13*. The buildings are used to house county staff and equipment for a variety of administrative and other purposes. In addition to the facilities listed, the County owns and leases space to the Southwest Washington Health District (SWWHD) and the Columbia River Mental Health agency. In addition, a building was just acquired on 500 West 8th

Street in Vancouver that the County plans to continue leasing to tenants until a time at which county departments would move into it to allow space for the seventh Superior County courtroom in the courthouse.

Population growth projected through 2013 will require additional space for office, court rooms, detention, maintenance and storage uses. The three (3) highest priority needs are for detention space through expansion, remodel, of the Juvenile Detention Center and special detention needs.

Table 6.13 Existing County Buildings

COUNTY OWNED - COUNTY OCCUPIED		OTHER OWNED - COUNTY OCCUPIED	
BUILDING	SQUARE FT	BUILDING	SQUARE FT
1408 FRANKLIN	24,953	1300 ESTHER	11,848
911 EMERGENCY SERVICES CENTER	18,000	914 ESTHER	911
78TH STREET OFFICES	48,464	2404 EAST MILL PLAIN	4,560
CENTER FOR DEATH INVESTIGATION	6,100	MULLIGAN BUILDING	11,351
CLARK COUNTY COURTHOUSE	82,022	WOLFE BUILDING	4,198
CORRECTION CENTER	165,970	BOYD BUILDING	1,430
FRANKLIN COURT	25,000	CONSOLIDATED COMPUTER CTR.	7,300
GENERAL SERVICES BUILDING	16,000	DNR FACILITY	5,028
JUVENILE	47,350	EAST PRECINCT	2,670
MABRY	3,360	FACILITIES WAREHOUSE	4,000
TASK FORCE HEADQUARTERS	4,100	TEMPORARY MORGUE	1,250
TRIPLEX	2,460	WEST PRECINCT	3,000
PORTABLES	3,360		
149TH STREET / CENTRAL PRECINCT	2,200		
TOTAL	449,675	TOTAL	57,546

Juvenile Detention

The most substantial deficiency in the existing Juvenile Detention Center is in the detention area. The most immediate problem is that the number of sleeping rooms is too few for the number of youth which must regularly be housed. The insufficiency of the detention housing has forced the implementation of programs that divert youth away from lengthy detention stays such as early release programs for youth that would otherwise be detained, a more aggressive diversion and intervention program, and a successful day reporting system.

The current request and plans for the Juvenile Detention Center Expansion project involve expanding the facility from its present 38 beds to 120 beds at an estimated capital cost of \$18.5 million. The current facility is located on a block in downtown Vancouver bordered by 12th street, Franklin street, Esther street and 11th street. The current pending proposal is an increase in the local sales tax by .1%. This sales tax measure is limited to use in the detention facilities.

In addition to the capital costs for juvenile expansion, operating costs for the expanded facility would increase dramatically. It is

anticipated that the juvenile operating budget would increase approximately \$300,000 each year until full capacity is reached in the facility.

Adult Detention

After a presentation by a consulting firm, it is clear that the future needs for adult jail space cannot be met within the current County revenue projections. Possible funding may include a public voted bond issue. Current plans include the construction of minimum security facilities off-site from the downtown campus, this site would include jail industries and work release inmates. The location for this facility is still being considered, but the County has determined that it will be outside the downtown campus area and within a non-residential zoned area.

As a matter of immediate planning, staff from the Sheriff's Office and Corrections are making the recommendation to alleviate the jail overcrowding immediately through the construction and use of temporary facilities. These temporary facilities could include 120-400 beds that allow for jail industries of recycling and signage, work release and/or

nursery operations. Five (5) million dollars was allocated for this project in the 1996 budget.

The needed expansion of the high security jail space would be located adjacent to the current main jail in downtown Vancouver. It is anticipated that this project would involve the construction of facilities immediately adjacent to the present main jail at an estimated cost of \$60.0 million.

Administration Space

The county has recently acquired a building at 500 West 8th Street at a cost of \$2.24 million that will house general government departments. Currently the building is occupied by other public and private tenants. It is the County's intention to allow these tenants to remain in the building until the time that the County would be ready to remodel the space to accommodate the intended department tenants. As a result, the revenues from the leases in the building would be applied to debt service for bonds used to

purchase the building. Total lease revenues expected to be received are \$919,000.

Another building in the downtown campus area that currently houses much of the Public Works Department Staff is also being considered for acquisition. The cost of this building is estimated at \$1.5 million.

The need for a large public service center has not been diminished by this action. But the construction of such a facility can be delayed until much later as a result of the acquisition and planned acquisition of existing facilities. Once built it would be located in the downtown Vancouver campus area to house county departments currently located in the courthouse not associated with law and justice, as well as other departments now leasing space elsewhere. Overall, the primary location for county buildings will continue to be the downtown Vancouver campus area. Satellite centers elsewhere in the county would include sheriff's precincts, community service centers, and public works locations. Future projects through 2000 are listed in *Table 6.14*.

Table 6.14 Clark County General Buildings Estimated Capital Expenditures, 1994-2000

PROJECT	SQUARE FOOTAGE	ESTIMATED COST	PROJECTED FUNDING SOURCES
COUNTY CAMPUS ANNEX			
8TH STREET	40,700	\$2.2 million	Capital Reserve
PUBLIC WORKS	15,800	\$1.5 million	Road Fund
DEATH INVESTIGATION CENTER	8,000	\$1.2 million	Capital Reserve
DETENTION	161,200		
JUVENILE		\$18.5 million	General obligation bonds financed through real estate excise tax and/or increased sales tax revenues
ADULT		\$65.0 million	
COURTHOUSE	81,000	\$1.3 million	Same as above
SW WASHINGTON HEALTH DISTRICT	152,200	\$6.0 million	Proceeds from the sale of property; Real estate excise tax
TOTAL	639,600	\$40.2 million	NA

In addition, as a result of the addition of seventh superior court judge in 1996, the courthouse will have to be remodeled to accommodate another courtroom. Estimated cost to remodel the courthouse are \$1.5 million.

Through 2012, additional building needs include community service centers (\$345,000), general services facilities (\$624,000) and public works facilities (\$3.2 million). During this time the public service center building would also be considered at projected costs of \$24.0 Million.

Coordination with Other Plan Elements

In the event that funding is insufficient to meet the capital needs for any of the above described projects, a reassessment of the land use element and other elements of the capital facilities plan will occur. Other funding possibilities and levels of service will also be reassessed. This will be done to make certain appropriate action will be taken to ensure the internal consistency of the land use and capital facilities portions of the plan.

Electricity

Public Utility District No. 1 of Clark County (Clark Public Utilities) is a consumer-owned public utility which serves the entire Clark County area with electricity. Clark Public Utilities (CPU) is a non-generating utility which buys the majority of its power from the Bonneville Power Administration. The remainder of its needs are met by power from the Washington Public Power Supply System's Packwood Hydroelectric Project, the Columbia Storage Power Exchange and the Great Western Malting Company.

CPU has a significant investment in electrical transmission and distribution equipment throughout the county. The utility has three electric utility centers: the Electric Center in downtown Vancouver, the Ed Fisher Customer Service and Operations Center in Orchards and the Camas Customer Service and Operations Center in Camas. In addition, it operates 46 substations, 108 miles of 69- and 115-thousand volt (69 kV and 115 kV) transmission line, 1,700 miles of overhead distribution and 1,100 miles of underground distribution to serve its approximately 117,000 customers. These facilities are located primarily in the urban area of Clark County. Most of the rural area is served with relatively minor facilities.

Current policies require CPU to provide electricity to all those who request it. CPU should be able to meet the needs for electricity in Clark County's urban areas and rural centers without making substantial investments in new transmission, transformation, and distribution facilities. Most CPU substations and transmission lines are located within urban areas of southern Clark County. Recent research into the health effects of electro-magnetic fields has raised questions about the compatibility of high voltage electrical facilities with intensive urban development. Guidelines for the siting of these facilities are under development. BPA and Clark County rely primarily on hydroelectric power because water in the area is plentiful and generation historically has been cheap. However, as the effort to connect the environmental impacts of dams on rivers and streams has increased, so has the cost of electricity. CPU is seeking alternative sources of power, including the possibility of constructing a gas-fired generation facility.

Natural Gas

Northwest Natural Gas is the sole purveyor of natural gas in Clark County. It receives its supply from the Northwest Pipeline Corporation, which owns and operates a 7,000 mile interstate pipeline system. Northwest Natural Gas anticipates a future need for routine infrastructure construction and maintenance, with additional distribution lines constructed on an as needed basis. Northwest Pipeline's current and future need is to keep those corridors accessible for maintenance. Many easements are non-exclusive, with only subsurface rights reserved. New development and subdivision issues are not addressed by these easements.

Since significant safety issues arise when development occurs along natural gas pipelines, this issue could be a major concern for the provision of natural gas to Clark County in the future.

Telecommunications

The telecommunications industry is currently in the midst of tremendous advances in technology. Cellular and optical fiber technologies are transforming the way service is delivered. In addition, the physical barriers that separate data, video, and voice technologies are rapidly disappearing. With the breakup of AT&T in 1984, new technology and new providers have entered the market at a rapid pace.

These changes have fostered a competitive industry. Three local telecommunication companies provide service to Clark County residents. These companies are U.S. West Communications (USWC), General Telephone (GTE), and Lewis River Telephone Company.

The three telephone companies serving the Clark County area are integrating fiber optic cable into their current system. All major cities in the USWC service area within Clark County had fiber optic cable in place by 1992. Copper cable is still being used to connect fiber optic lines to customers unless warranted by special customer needs. The decision to place fiber optic cable is based on the U.S. West office location, the customer location, and the capacity needs of the customer.

GTE has fiber optic lines in the Camas, Washougal, and Washougal River area. Fiber optic lines are also placed between Camas and the RCA Sharp plant located in northwest

Camas. At the GTE and U.S. West Communications border west of the RCA Sharp plant, the existing copper lines were replaced with fiber optic cable. The total fiber optic cable within GTE's service area in Clark County is estimated at 10 to 20 miles, which is a small percentage compared to existing copper lines. Fiber optic lines were not placed at all during 1992 and 1993. Since 1993, placement is occurring on a year to year basis.

Lewis River Telephone Company currently has seven miles of fiber optic cable. Thirty miles are planned to be placed by the end of next year. This number is estimated to be less than two percent of the total miles of existing copper lines.

As detailed in the *Transportation Element, Chapter 3*, telecommunications will play an increasingly important role in the transportation demand management strategy of Clark County. This will require a substantial commitment to telecommuting and its related communication technology. In general, GTE and Lewis River should be able to meet the growing demand for telecommunications services. However, the county will need to work with providers to assure that employers know the benefits of telecommuting in the work place.

Libraries

The Fort Vancouver Regional Library System (FVRLS) encompasses a 4,200 square mile area in three counties-Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat. The system includes nine branch libraries located in Vancouver, Battle Ground, Ridgefield, Washougal, and at Vancouver Mall in Clark County, and at North Bonneville and Stevenson in Skamania County, and White Salmon and Goldendale in Klickitat County. In addition to the branch libraries, the FVRLS has 3 bookmobiles and an extensive outreach program for elderly, and disable community in the three counties.

Formerly used National Library Association standards are no longer widely used because local conditions vary so greatly nationwide. Standards in general use, and those used by Fort Vancouver Regional Library System (FVRLS) indicate that there should be .60 square feet of library space per capita. FVRLS currently has 0.27 square feet per capita -- less than half the standard -- and lacks an adequate amount of space and number of branches to serve existing users. This per

capita level is significantly below that of other more urban areas of the state. Branches do not exist between Vancouver Mall and Camas in the east county area. In the late 1980s, two branches closed in the unincorporated areas of Hazel Dell and Orchards due to budget deficits. The Battle Ground branch and the existing Ridgefield facility are inadequate in size and are understaffed to meet local population demands. While book mobiles bring some persons and areas a basic level of service, book mobiles are not calculated into square foot per capita figures by library systems because they provide no direct access to reference materials, reading space, and other services.

Near future system expansion plans include a new Ridgefield branch library and one additional branch, at a location yet to be determined, in 1994. With these additions, the square feet per capita level will increase to .29. By 2010 within Clark County, the FVRLS expects it will need to expand the size of the Vancouver and Battle Ground branches, and to add two other additional branches within the county.

GOALS AND POLICIES

State Goals and Mandates

The statewide planning goals were adopted in 1990 as part of *GMA*. Included within the 13 goals was the mandate to ensure that public services and facilities necessary to support development shall be adequate to the development (*RCW 36.70A.020*).

Community Framework Plan

Both the policies within the Countywide Planning Policies and the *Community Framework Plan (CFP)* frame the issues and needs for the *20-Year Plan* with regards to capital facilities. See *Section 6.0* of the *CFP* for these policies.

20 Year Plan Policies

GOAL 6.1: Ensure that necessary and adequate capital facilities and services are provided to all development in Clark County in a manner consistent with the 20-Year Plan.

Policies:

- 6.1.1 Continue to plan for and provide capital facilities and services as necessary to support development consistent with the *20-year Plan*, or coordinate and facilitate the planning and provision of such facilities and services by other public or private entities.
- 6.1.2 The primary role of Clark County regarding service provisions shall involve the planning and delivery of regional, rather than urban, services. It is the policy of Clark County, that in general, cities are the most appropriate units of local government to provide urban governmental services, and that in general it is not appropriate that urban governmental services be extended or expanded to rural areas except in those limited circumstances shown to be necessary to protect basic public health and safety and the environment and when such services are financially supportable at rural densities and do not permit urban development.
- 6.1.3 Explore and assist other providers to explore a variety of funding sources for capital facilities and services, including a range of federal, state, and other grants where possible.
- 6.1.4 Encourage and assist other utilities, service districts and providers to pursue the use of impact fees, special assessment and improvement districts and other local financing techniques to fund new facilities and services.
- 6.1.5 Assist and facilitate the siting of capital facility and service infrastructure in a manner consist with the *20-Year Plan*, through appropriate land use planning and development review policies and procedures.
- 6.1.6 Develop a process for identifying and siting essential regional public facilities such as state or regional transportation facilities, state education facilities, airports, corrections facilities, solid waste handling facilities and regional parks.
- 6.1.7 Clark County incorporates by reference the sewer and water *Capital Facilities Plans* of the Hazel Dell Sewer District, Clark Public Utilities, and the City of Vancouver. The County should review

future changes to these *Capital Facilities Plans* on an annual basis to ensure that consistency with County capital facility and land use plans is maintained.

GOAL 6.2: Provide water service to all households minimizing environmental impacts and, at least, long-term public cost.

Policies:

- 6.2.1 All new development in the urban area shall be served by a connection to a public water system. Existing developments within the urban area using private wells shall be encouraged to convert to public water usage.
- 6.2.2 Private wells may be used in the rural area, subject to the review of the Southwest Washington Health District.
- 6.2.3 In cases where public water service is needed, it shall be provided by a water purveyor under the following order of preference, articulated within the *Coordinated Water System Plan (CWSP)*:
 - a. Direct or satellite service by the water utility designated by the *CWSP* to serve the area.
 - b. Interim or permanent service by an adjacent water utility. *CWSP* service area designations shall be adjusted if permanent service is arranged.
 - c. Satellite service on an interim basis by CPU, if the development to be served is located outside CPUs service territory.
 - d. Formation of a new utility and construction of a new public water system to serve only the development. *CWSP* service area shall be adjusted to reflect the change.
- 6.2.4 The *CWSP* shall be reviewed and updated at a minimum of every five years. Design standards included in the *CWSP* shall be reviewed and amended annually, if necessary.
- 6.2.5 CPU shall continue to be recognized as the satellite water system management agency for Clark County.
- 6.2.6 Clark Public Utilities may construct and manage satellite water systems within

the service territory of other water utilities, but only if a prior agreement is reached with the utility designated by the *CWSP* to serve the area. Such agreements shall address issues of equipment compatibility, asset transfer and other issues deemed necessary by the parties.

- 6.2.7 Major water utilities, including Clark Public Utilities, may construct extensions of existing services in the rural area only if service is provided at a level that will accommodate only the type of land use and development density called for in the *20-Year Plan*, recognizing maximum buildout and reasonable allowances in design of facilities to promote overall system efficiency. Extension of water service shall be permitted to public regional park facilities that are outside of but adjacent to an urban growth boundary.
 - 6.2.8 Water transmission lines constructed in rural areas for the purpose of connecting water systems shall be limited from use for tributary line tie-ins.
 - 6.2.9 The *CWSP* shall be amended to reflect any water service extensions in the rural area.
 - 6.2.10 Developments shall demonstrate a sufficient and sustainable source of water before development approval is issued.
 - 6.2.11 Water service plans shall be coordinated with the adopted *20-Year Plan* map and policies, including the designation of urban growth areas.
 - 6.2.12 Work with other cities and special districts to develop fair and consistent policies/incentives to eliminate private water systems in urban areas, and to encourage connection to public water systems. Unused wells should be identified and decommissioned.
 - 6.2.13 Practice and encourage water conservation.
 - 6.2.14 Work with water service providers to encourage public education and outreach programs on water reuse, conservation, reclamation and other new water efficient technology.
 - 6.2.15 Encourage water pricing structures to facilitate conservation and to cover the full cost of providing water service.
- GOAL 6.3: Provide sewer service within urban growth areas efficiently and at least public cost.**
- Policies:**
- 6.3.1 All new development in the urban area shall be served by a connection to a public sewer system.
 - 6.3.2 Develop strategies for the conversion of on-site septic disposal systems to public sewer use in the urban area.
 - 6.3.3 New and existing development in the rural area outside of rural centers shall use individual on-site septic disposal systems, unless public sewer is available. New or existing development within designated rural centers may use community septic systems.
 - 6.3.4 Installation of new individual or community septic systems shall be subject to the approval of the Southwest Washington Health District (SWWHD). Installation approvals for new septic systems shall include agreements for mandatory future monitoring unless waived by the SWWHD.
 - 6.3.5 Require regular inspections of existing on-site sewage disposal systems in wellhead protection areas.
 - 6.3.6 Work with the SWWHD to support efforts to establish mandatory sub-surface sewage disposal septic inspection/maintenance programs for existing septic systems, particularly areas needing environmental health guarantees.
 - 6.3.7 Expand treatment facilities to meet current and future demand for development within urban areas.
 - 6.3.8 Extension of public sewer service shall not be permitted outside urban growth areas, except in cases where there is a documented threat to public health or the environment, or to provide sewer service to public regional park facilities that are outside of but adjacent to an urban growth boundary.
 - 6.3.9 Extension of public sewer service beyond city limits shall be prohibited without

annexation or commitments to annexation in the near future.

- 6.3.10 Sewer service plans shall be coordinated with the *20-Year Plan* policies and maps, including urban growth area designations.
- 6.3.11 Discourage new development from relying on forced mains or STEP systems for effluent treatment within the UGA.
- 6.3.12 Require the use of public or community septic systems in areas where soil characteristics limit the use of on-site sewage systems.
- 6.3.13 Provide public education about the potential for groundwater contamination from on-site sewage disposal systems.

GOAL 6.4: Provide a long-range stormwater management program to minimize impacts from stormwater discharge.

Policies:

- 6.4.1 Maintain clear development review standards for the control of the quantity and quality of storm water discharge from development projects which emphasize on-site retention, treatment and infiltration of run-off to minimize impacts on the established wastewater system and local streams, rivers and lakes.
- 6.4.2 Limit the removal of vegetation during development in order to reduce storm water run off and erosion.
- 6.4.3 Develop and implement comprehensive storm water management plans, including funding provisions, for all watersheds in the county.
- 6.4.4 Develop measures countywide to ensure erosion and sediment control for new development, re-development, and excavation projects.
- 6.4.5 Explore the possible formation of a storm water utility.
- 6.4.6 Develop a watershed protection implementation program with the goals of resolving and preventing deterioration of all local water resources within identified watersheds. The program shall incorporate servicing groundwater protection measures that safeguard drinking water quality, protect surface water quality, insure groundwater recharge, control urban flooding, enhance wetland habitat, and establish local funding mechanisms for water quality and water resource protection. The program should be implemented according to the following schedule, subject to adjustment:
 - a. *Phase I* - Burnt Bridge Creek, 1996. The *Burnt Bridge Creek Watershed Plan* and *Appendices A* through *G* are hereby adopted and incorporated herein by this reference with the proactive level of service identified as the service level to be provided within the Burnt Bridge Creek Basin.
 - b. *Phase II* - Salmon Creek and Lakeshore Watersheds, late 1996.
 - c. *Phase III* - Lacamas and Columbia Slope Watersheds, 1997.
 - d. *Phase IV* - Whipple, Gee, Allen Canyon and Flume Creek Watersheds, following completion of *Phase III*.
 - e. *Phase V* - Lewis River, Washougal and Gibbons Creek Watersheds, following completion of *Phase IV*.
- 6.4.7 Establish a coordinated approach with local jurisdictions to solve both surface water and groundwater.
- 6.4.8 Clark County shall monitor and update the stormwater control ordinance and related policies and standards to implement and enhance stormwater management.

GOAL 6.5: Coordinate with individual school districts to ensure that school sites and facilities are constructed to meet the educational needs of county residents.

Policies:

- 6.5.1 Schools and related facilities are strongly encouraged to locate within the urban growth areas. Schools may be constructed in the urban reserve area where necessary to serve population growth within and outside of the urban growth boundary if the following conditions are met:
 - a. School sites within the urban reserve area shall be located as close to the

urban growth boundary as possible, preferably within 1/4 mile.

- b. The school district shall demonstrate that the proposed site is more suitable than alternative sites within the existing urban growth area. Suitability includes factors such as size, topography, zoning, surrounding land uses, transportation, environmental concerns and location within the area to be served.
 - c. The school district shall demonstrate that transportation facilities serving the site are adequate to support site generated traffic, including buses.
 - d. The school district shall agree to connect to public water and sewer when they become available. Availability is defined to be within 300 feet of the site without requiring special facilities such as pump stations or capital improvements such as larger pipes to increase capacity of the system.
- 6.5.2 Encourage and work with school districts serving predominantly rural area populations to locate within designated rural centers.
 - 6.5.3 Encourage and work with school districts to allow for shared access of facilities for recreational or other public purposes.
 - 6.5.4 Encourage and work with school districts to maintain and increase efficient delivery of services through non-traditional means such as year round schools, regionally shared facilities and services and maximum use of technology advances.
 - 6.5.5 Provide for the use of School Impact Fees as a funding source for school capital facilities.
 - 6.5.6 *Capital Facilities Plans* for the school districts of Vancouver, Evergreen, Battle Ground, Camas, Washougal, Ridgefield, Hockinson, La Center and Green Mountain shall be adopted by reference through the adoption of the *20-Year Comprehensive Plan*.

GOAL 6.6: Provide police, fire and emergency medical services

efficiently and cost effectively to residents of Clark County.

Policies:

- 6.6.1 Serve as lead agency for the development of a collaborative, countywide public safety services plan by 1997.
- 6.6.2 Encourage interjurisdictional cooperation among law enforcement and corrections agencies to continue to further develop, where practicable, shared service and facility use.
- 6.6.3 Encourage continued and further interjurisdictional cooperation among fire districts where practicable, in areas of mutual aid, sharing of equipment and facilities, and consolidation of districts.
- 6.6.4 Encourage development of community benchmarks and program performance measures to monitor outcomes from public safety efforts.
- 6.6.5 Mobile services such as police, fire, and other services may establish precincts and similar facilities beyond the urban growth area. The level of service provided in such cases should remain rural in nature.
- 6.6.6 Provide for regular fire and building inspections.
- 6.6.7 Continue to provide for animal control services.
- 6.6.8 Encourage resource allocation decisions based on achievement of outcomes rather than simply workload or output measures.
- 6.6.9 Provide for comprehensive origin and cause and complete incendiary and arson fire investigation across jurisdictional and regional boundaries.
- 6.6.10 Develop and implement a comprehensive information management system for all fire, law enforcement, emergency responders, general government, and the general population with interagency use and compatibility.
- 6.6.11 Provide for regional training of fire, law enforcement, and other emergency service providers. Provide educational and training opportunities for identified segments of the population who use emergency services.

- 6.6.12 Identify funding mechanisms with inter jurisdictional participation and cooperation to support regionally delivered programs.
- 6.6.13 Identify and implement comprehensive emergency management plans for all service providers consistent with the elements of the *Comprehensive Plan*.

GOAL 6.7: Provide solid waste services efficiently and cost-effectively to residents of Clark County.

Policies:

- 6.7.1 Continue implementation of the county's *Solid Waste Management Plan* in order to achieve a 50 percent reduction in the solid waste stream in the next 20 years.
- 6.7.2 Implement mandatory solid waste collection in all or parts of the county, and continue development and implementation of curbside collection of recyclable materials in rural county areas.
- 6.7.3 Continue on-going consideration of the needed balance in solid waste disposal between land filling, incineration and recycling, and consider further reduction measures, such as deposits and product container and packaging bans.

GOAL 6.8: Facilitate the provision of electricity, natural gas and other services to the residents of Clark County.

Policies:

- 6.8.1 Encourage location of transmission lines within rights-of-way.
- 6.8.2 Maintain policies for the siting of substation facilities.
- 6.8.3 Encourage and coordinate with other agencies in the provision of libraries and social services.
- 6.8.4 Provide for adequate facilities for county government to deliver services to the public.
- 6.8.5 Encourage and coordinate with other utility providers in the provision of electric, gas, telecommunications and cable.

GOAL 6.9: Develop specific concurrency management standards for incorporation into the development review process, to determine the precise requirements for the timing, funding and circumstances for the provision of concurrent services and facilities.

Policies:

- 6.9.1 Develop direct concurrency requirements for the provision of transportation, water, sewer, and storm water facilities and services.
- 6.9.2 Develop direct or indirect concurrency requirements for school services consistent with existing requirements of *RCW 58.17.110*.
- 6.9.3 Develop provisions ensuring parks and recreation facilities are provided for all developments as specified in *Chapter 8, Parks and Recreation*, of the *20-Year Plan*.
- 6.9.4 Capital Facilities plans for the *Clark County Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element* shall be adopted by reference through the adoption of the Supporting Documentation associated with the *20-Year Comprehensive Plan*.
- 6.9.5 Develop standards or guidelines to determine how the sufficiency of governmental services, including fire protection, law enforcement, solid waste service, telecommunications, electricity, natural gas, government buildings, libraries and other services shall be addressed during the development review process.
- 6.9.6 Services should be provided, and direct or indirect level of service standards should be established, consistent with general service provision levels outlined in *Table 6.15*.
- 6.9.7 Establish a public process to re-evaluate the Land Use Element of the *Comprehensive Plan* upon determination that financing resources are inadequate to provide necessary public facilities and services to implement the plan.

GOAL 6.10: Ensure that capital facilities and services are provided in as cost efficient manner as possible and are consistent with the land use

objectives of the 20-Year Plan and State Growth Management Act.

Policies:

- 6.10.1 Coordinate land use planning and decisions with capital facilities planning and service provision.
- 6.10.2 Encourage and work with utilities, special districts and other service providers to ensure their functional plans are consistent with county level of service standards.

- 6.10.3 Encourage and facilitate inter-jurisdictional cooperation and analysis to assess fiscal and other impacts to service delivery related to annexation.
- 6.10.4 Encourage and facilitate the exploration of shared use of facilities and services between service providers where feasible. Activities to be encouraged range from shared responsibility agreements between police and fire service providers, to development of joint facilities such as schools and parks.

Table 6.15 General Service Provision Levels

SERVICE	URBAN	URBAN RESERVE	RURAL	RURAL CENTERS
WATER	Public water for domestic and fire flow.	Coordinate water systems to match future plans, discourage potable wells for individual dwelling units or use of satellite systems.	Private wells	Public water
SEWER	Public sewer	Septic systems with mandatory maintenance and hook-up when sewer is available.	Septic systems	Community septic systems
STORM DRAINAGE	Gutters, pipes, and regional runoff treatment and control facilities.	Plan for future gutters, pipes, and regional storm water treatment and control facilities.	Open conveyance system. On-site treatment and control of runoff.	Regional runoff treatment and control. May have curbs and gutters/ditches.
SCHOOLS	Full range of school facilities.	Plan for full range of future schools.	Limited	Schools should locate in rural centers.
POLICE	Police protection and facilities.	Sheriff services	Sheriff services	Sheriff services with potential for neighborhood headquarters.
FIRE	Fire protection rating of 3 or better; urban fire flow of 1,000 gpm or better.	Fire protection rating of 3 or better; urban fire flow of 1,000 gpm or better.	Fire protection rating of 6 or less; rural fire flow of 500 gpm.	Fire protection rating of 6 or better.
ELECTRICITY	Electricity	Electricity	Electricity	Electricity
PARKS	Neighborhood, community, and regional.	Plan for neighborhood, community, and regional.	Regional parks	Rural centers may have neighborhood parks.
LIBRARY SERVICES	Libraries	Bookmobile	Bookmobile	Bookmobile
GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS	Facilities	Plan for future facilities.	No facilities	Limited facilities
TELECOMMUNICATION	Phone and fiber optic services fully available	Phone available, plan for fiber optic services	Phone available	Phone available, plan for fiber optic services
NATURAL GAS	Available throughout	Available throughout	Available throughout	Available throughout
SOLID WASTE	Weekly collection from customers, mandatory recycling	Centralized collection, mandatory recycling	Centralized collection, voluntary recycling	Centralized collection, mandatory recycling

gpm = gallons per minute

Source: Clark County Department of Community Development.

- 6.10.5 Encourage compact development patterns which are more easily and efficiently served, rather than less dense development patterns which are more difficult and costly to serve.
- 6.10.6 Within the urban area, encourage and facilitate new development to occur sooner and at greater intensities in areas where necessary services and facilities are already in place and available to serve such development, and to a lesser extent in areas where such facilities are not yet available but can be extended.
- 6.10.7 To encourage maximum use of existing public facilities and services, encourage new and infill development in the urban area to occur at the maximum densities envisioned by the *20-Year Plan*.
- 6.10.8 Pursue true cost pricing service policies and encourage other providers to pursue similar policies, which allocate the full and true cost of connection to and use of facility and service systems to new system users, and do not allocate costs created by systems additions to existing system users.
- 6.10.9 In evaluating land use requests in the rural area, the availability of public water or sewer shall not be considered as providing sole justification, or providing any additional justification in combination with other factors, for applications for development densities beyond those specified by the *20-Year Plan*, or for proposed changes to the plan.
- 6.10.10 Changes to the *20-Year Plan* shall not be approved which impose inordinate additional net costs on mobile, centralized services such as police, fire, emergency services, school busing or solid waste services.
- 6.10.11 In evaluating requests for an extension of urban services or levels of service beyond the urban growth boundary in a manner consistent with the *20-Year Plan*, Clark County shall consider the implications of such an extension for future growth and development patterns. In evaluating requests for changes to the urban growth boundary or other proposals for development beyond the density specified by the *20-Year Plan*, Clark County shall consider implications of such actions for service provision and efficiency of provision.
- 6.10.12 Coordinate with and encourage continued participation of other jurisdictions and service entities with the *Coordinated Water System Plan*, the *Solid Waste Management Plan* and other service plans, where such plans do not conflict with the *20-Year Plan*.
- 6.10.13 Mobile services such as police, fire and other services should locate facilities within the urban area. Precinct or substation facilities may be located in the rural area where necessary to serve rural population, but are encouraged to locate in rural nodes or areas of concentrated development. The level of service provided must be rural in nature only.
- 6.10.14 The county may invest in urban services or require that urban standards be provided through development review by non-residential developments in the rural area if:
- It is necessary to remedy threats to public health or safety; or,
 - the lead agency can demonstrate that the service extension or the application of urban development standards would yield long-term capital cost savings to the jurisdiction as a whole or the investment would complete an identified system which serves the entire growth area (such as a trail or bicycle network); or,
 - there is a need to permit urban service extension to a non-residential development that conforms with the *20-Year Plan*, and serves the public health, safety, and welfare.

STRATEGIES AND IMPLEMENTATION

- Implement water conservation techniques at existing county facilities and design new facilities to optimize water conservation.
- Require new large commercial and industrial developments and high water users, such as schools, parks and golf

courses, to implement water reuse and reclamation techniques.

- Revise zoning and subdivision ordinances to encourage design of new development that is consistent with and capable of accommodating the long-term construction of gravity flow sewer systems.
- Maintain a project listing of priority watersheds for basin planning and priority capital improvement projects.
- Endorse and encourage community policing and associated decentralization of police operations to move services closer to areas where services are demanded.
- Encourage and invest in programs and services which provide for partnerships with the community or other entities which help to solve local problems in a cross-disciplinary manner.
- Encourage use of a diversity of resources such as volunteers and civilians where appropriate to improve cost effectiveness of public safety operations.
- Conduct resource allocations based on achievement of outcomes rather than simply workload or output measures.
- Encourage the use of installed fire protection or increased fire resistive construction materials or design and increased use of sprinklers and alarm systems by providing incentives or non-penalties for their use.
- Encourage the development of community oriented police, fire and emergency services programs designed to meet community identified needs.
- Provide increased enforcement and control of illegal dumping.
- Continue consideration of an East County transfer station for solid wastes.
- Protect transmission corridors for energy resources from conflicting development.
- Develop and, if necessary, revise policies consistent with current scientific research regarding electrical

magnetic field impacts from high voltage electrical lines, or other utility transmission or substation facilities with health potential impacts. Such policies should at a minimum provide for notice of potential impacts to prospective residents adjacent or near such facilities.

- Incentive policies may be developed to allow adjustments of impact fees where such adjustments are necessary to provide or encourage the provision of a demonstrable public benefit, provided that public share budgetary implications of such adjustments have been addressed.

CURRENT REVENUE SOURCES FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS

General Fund: This is the basic operating fund for the city or county that comes from general tax and revenue resources of the jurisdictions. General fund moneys are often used to finance capital improvement projects. The county's general fund should decrease dramatically in the future as cities annex incorporated lands within their UGAs.

Additional Voter Approved Financing: Voter approved financing is debt financing through voter approved bonds and levies which are funded with property tax revenues. Bonds require a 60 percent voter approval, levies require a simple majority. Both bond and levy financing are described below.

General Obligation Bonds: The cities or county can raise revenues for major capital projects by selling tax-exempt municipal bonds and incurring debt. Bonds are basically loans from investors who are paid interest in return for their investment. The jurisdiction uses its property tax revenues to make its interest and principal payments on the bonds.

The State of Washington limits the amount of debt that jurisdictions can incur. It does so by limiting the amount of taxable property (measured by the property's assessed value) that can be committed to pay off debt. In the State of Washington, jurisdictions are authorized to incur, with a 60 percent majority of voter approval, 2.5 percent of their assessed valuation in general obligation debt for general purposes, 2.5 percent for utility related capital expenditures, and 2.5 percent for parks and open space acquisition.

Of the 2.5 percent allowed for general purposes, a jurisdiction may commit 0.75 percent without a vote of the people. This is known as limited general obligation. An additional 0.75 percent can be incurred to pay for long-term leases.

Property Taxes: The cities and county can raise money for general or specific purposes by increasing property taxes through property tax levies. The State of Washington has an annual 106 percent lid on property taxes. However, with a simple majority of voter approval, cities and counties can increase the lid and levy an additional tax on property for a specified length of time ranging from one to 10 years for a specified purpose.

Intergovernmental Revenues: The county and cities receive grants and matching funds for major capital projects. These revenues come from the state and federal governments for specific projects. Some examples include the *Centennial Clean Water Fund*, the *Water Pollution Control State Revolving Fund* and *Community Development Block Grants*.

Fees and User Charges: The *GMA* provides cities and counties the authority to implement a variety of taxes for use in mitigating the impacts of growth on capital facilities. User charges and developer fees are designed to recoup the cost of providing public facilities or services by charging all or a portion of the fee to those who benefit from such services. As a tool for affecting the pace and pattern of development such fees may vary for the quantity and location of services provided. Examples include impact fees, utility taxes and special assessment fees.

Lease Purchase: The city and counties can engage in lease purchase agreements for purchasing major equipment like fire trucks or 9-1-1 communications systems. There are a number of reasons, besides current market conditions, which make lease purchase agreements attractive. A primary advantage is leasing a building with an option to buy eliminates the need for the jurisdiction to issue bonds to build a facility. The lease payments are not considered as debt service and thus do not detract debt capacity. Since there is no obligation to buy, the jurisdiction can move as growth occurs. A potential disadvantage is that the lease purchase payments can cost more than current rents. A lease purchase agreement does not require voter approval.

Timber Excise Tax: The county and other local taxing districts (excluding cities) can enact a local timber excise on private timber at a rate of 4 percent, which is allowed as a credit against the State tax.

POTENTIAL NEW REVENUE SOURCES FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS

In addition to current revenue sources, there are a number of other financing options that could potentially be used for capital projects. A brief discussion of some potential sources is conducted below.

Mandatory Dedications or Fees in Lieu of: The city or county may require, as a condition of plat approval, that subdivision developers dedicate a certain portion of the land in the development or a equivalent fee in lieu of dedication be used for public purposes, such as roads, parks or schools.

Impact Fees: Several cities and counties in the region impose fees on developers to finance parks, schools and roads through the provision of the *GMA*. These impact fees are assessed on the construction of new homes and other buildings. The fees must reflect the costs of providing capital facilities needed to serve the new development. Some local school districts and jurisdictions in Clark County currently use impact fees to finance their capital facilities. This would be a new source for the county.

Special Assessment Districts: Special assessment districts implement financing methods for capital facilities which require partial or complete financing by entities other than the jurisdiction. These financing alternatives include those that require financial participation by the existing property owner or developers. Special assessment bonds are restricted to uses related to the purpose for which the district was created. Most typical types of districts include Local Improvement Districts, Road Improvement Districts and Utility Local Improvement Districts.

Growth Induced Tax Revenues: This revenue raising technique would divert some of the incremental tax revenue generated by new growth into a capital fund so that it could be used to finance infrastructure improvements necessary to support growth. For example, a certain percentage of the increment in property tax revenue generated by new growth could be diverted for a specific number of years into a

special capital projects fund. Money in that fund would be restricted to use for growth related capital project.

Regional Tax Base Sharing: Regional tax base sharing is a technique for redistributing local government revenues among jurisdictions in a metropolitan area. It generally involves placing a portion of the growth-related tax revenues collected by each jurisdiction into a pool, and then redistributing the pooled revenue among the jurisdictions according to a specified formula. The redistribution formula attempts to address fiscal imbalances or inequities that result from such factors as the inequity in tax generating capacity and public costs among jurisdictions, the unequal distribution among jurisdictions of public facilities that serve the regional population (i.e., the Salmon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant) and the concentration of both high and low tax generating users in specific jurisdictions. Tax base sharing is not widely used in the United States.

System Development Charges: May be used for storm water control and treatment facilities. Authorized under *RCW 36.94*.

Storm water Utility: Requires a basin plan to be adopted by Board of County Commissioners similar to existing Burnt Bridge Creek Utility. Authorized by *RCW 36.89* and *36.94*.

Voter Approved Real Estate Excise Transfer Taxes: In addition to the one-half-of-one percent of Real Estate Excise Transfer (REET) tax authorized by the State Legislature, cities and counties authorized to plan under *GMA* may also ask voters to approve additional REET taxes for planning and for open space acquisition.

Conservation Futures: The Conservation Futures levy is provided for in *Chapter 84.34* of the *Revised Code of Washington*. Boards of County Commissioners may impose by resolution a property tax up to six and one-quarter cents per thousand dollars of assessed value for the purpose of acquiring interest in open space, farm, and timber lands. The Board of Clark County Commissioners adopted the Conservation Futures levy in October 1985. Conservation Futures funds may be used for acquisition purposes only. Funds may be used to acquire mineral rights and leaseback agreements are permitted. The statute prohibits the use of eminent domain to acquire property.

Real Estate Excise Tax: *Chapter 84.46* of the *Revised Code of Washington* authorizes the governing bodies of counties and cities to impose excise taxes on the sale of real property within limits set by the statute. The authority of counties may be divided into four parts.

1. The Board of Commissioners may impose a real estate excise tax on the sale of all real property in unincorporated parts of the county at a rate not to exceed 1/4 of 1 percent of the selling price to fund "local capital improvements," including parks, playgrounds, swimming pools, water systems, bridges, sewers, etc. Also, the funds must be used "primarily for financing capital projects specified in a capital facilities plan element of a comprehensive plan . . ." This tax is now in effect in Clark County.
2. The Board of Commissioners may impose a real estate excise tax on the sale of all real property in the unincorporated parts of the county at a rate not to exceed 1/2 of 1 percent, in lieu of a five-tenths of one percent sales tax option authorized under *RCW 82.14.040 (2)*. These funds are not restricted to capital projects. The statute provides for a repeal mechanism. However, this levy is not available to Clark County, because it has implemented a portion of its discretionary sales tax option.
3. In counties that are required to prepare comprehensive plans under the new *Growth Management Act*, Boards of Commissioners are authorized to impose an additional real estate excise tax on all real property sales in unincorporated parts of the county at a rate not to exceed 1/4 of 1 percent. These funds must be used "solely for financing capital projects specified in a capital facilities plan element of a comprehensive plan." This taxing option is not yet in effect in Clark County.
4. With voter approval, Boards of Commissioners may also impose a real estate excise tax on each sale of real property in the county at a rate not to exceed 1 percent of the selling price for the specific purpose of acquiring and maintaining "local conservation areas."

Real Estate Excise Tax - Local Conservation

Areas: With voter approval, Boards of County Commissioners may impose an excise tax on each sale of real property in the county at rate not to exceed one percent of the selling price for the purpose of acquiring and maintaining conservation areas. The authorizing legislation (*RCW 82.46*) defines conservation areas as "land and water that has environmental,

agricultural, aesthetic, cultural, scientific, historic, scenic, or low-intensity recreational value for existing and future generations..." These areas include "open spaces, wetlands, marshes, aquifer recharge areas, shoreline areas, natural areas, and other lands and waters that are important to preserve flora and fauna."